

Appl. No. 09/715,586
Atty. Docket No. 5922R2C
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of January 6, 2005
Customer No. 27752

7

REMARKS

Claim amendments:

Claims 41 and 95 have each been amended to include the limitation that the material be activatable by the application of a tensile force.

Claims 2-8, 42-46, 96 and 103 have been cancelled.

Rejection under 35 USC §103:

Claims 1, 9-11, 14-18, 41, 47-51, 54-58, 66, 81, 95, 97-99, 101-103, and 105-107, stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilbur (U.S. Pat. No. 2,338,749) in view of Reed, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,054,697).

As amended, independent claims 41 and 95 provide that the storage wrap material of the claimed invention be activatable by the application of a tensile force to the material. Neither the *Wilbur* reference nor the *Reed* reference provides of the activation of sheet material by the application of a tensile force. Therefore, the combination of *Wilbur* and *Reed* does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations of the present invention. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 12, 52, 100, and 108 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilbur (U.S. Pat. No. 2,338,749) in view of the admitted prior art and further in view of Reed, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,054,697) and Kovac (U.S. Pat. No. 3,819,467).

As provided above, the combination of the *Wilbur* and *Reed* references does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitation of the invention. The addition of the *Kovac* reference does not cure the deficiencies of the *Wilbur-Reed* combination. Therefore the expanded combination of *Wilbur - Reed - Kovac*, does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of the invention as claimed. The admitted prior art also fails to provide the necessary teaching or suggestion to the combination. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/715,586
Atty. Docket No. 5922R2C
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of January 6, 2005
Customer No. 27752

8

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1, 9-12, 14-18, 41, 47-52, 54-58, 66, 81, 95, 97-103, and 105-108.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, ET AL



David K. Mattheis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,683
(513) 634-9359

June 6, 2005
Customer No. 27752